DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 276 SP 032 464

AUTHOR Goodwin, A. Lin
TITLE Beyond Band-Aid Solutions: A Multifaceted, Collaborative Approach to the Minority Teacher Shortage.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Anaheim, CA, March 3-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Black Colleges; *Black Teachers; *Consortia; Cooperative Planning; Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Minority Group Teachers; Preservice Teacher Education; Problem Solving; *Teacher Shortage

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the work of one collaborative--The Consortium on Teacher Quality and Supply--that combined the energies of several organizations in order to respond to the minority teacher shortage. The consortium was comprised of six historically black colleges and universities in the south and three graduate institutions of education. Chronologically, the paper begins with the establishment of the consortium in 1987, the introduction of key players, and a discussion of aims. It then moves to the collaborative process the consortium underwent, explains the activities designed by the consortium to address the minority teacher shortage, and ends with a progress report on current consortium activities. Conceptually, the paper examines the collaborative process in relation to what the literature has to say about successful collaborations, and uncovers some new understandings about factors which help support and facilitate collaboration. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEYOND BAND-AID SOLUTIONS: A MULTIFACETED, COLLABORATIVE APPROACH TO THE MINORITY TEACHER SHORTAGE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A. Lin Goodwin

AACTE Annual Meeting--Anaheim, CA March 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Lin Goodwin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 324276

Introduction: Who's in the classroom?

Education in this country is undergoing a period of change and reform. This is hardly surprising as educators scramble to respond to the plethora of reform reports that have made the headlines and are influencing public, professional and political debates about what is wrong with our schools. In the past five years, the focus on this educational reform movement has shifted attention from curricular changes (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), to an examination of the ways in which teachers are, or should be, prepared (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986). The question, 'Who is, or will be, teaching our children?' becomes paramount as we wrestle with several disturbing facts about those who are or hope to be in front of the classroom, and those who are waiting to receive instruction:

1) Given current trends, colleges will graduate only slightly under half the 1.5 million teachers it is estimated will be needed between 1987 and 1992 (Darling-Hammond, 1987).

2) Groups which have traditionally filled the teaching ranks--women and minorities--are turning away from the profession as a result of increasing employment opportunities in fields more lucrative or prestigious than education. In, addition, there has

SP 032 464

been a "strong shift away from teaching as a preferred occupation for college graduates" in general (Darling-Hammond, 1987, p. 59).

3) Those college students who demonstrate the least academic promise, according to college entrance examinations, are often also those who contemplate a teaching career (Darling-Hammond, 1987; Galambos, 1985; Garibaldi, 1987).

4) While our teachers remain predominantly white, our classrooms are increasingly filled with students who are minority. In fact, 23 of the 25 largest school districts in the country now have minority majorities (Graham, 1987), and it is estimated that by the year 2000, one in three students will be non-white (Hodgkinson, 1985).

Given these disturbing facts, it becomes abundantly evident that we need good teachers, we need more teachers, and we need teachers who both comprehend the needs of and reflect a school population that is becoming more ethnically diverse. Obviously, the decrease in teacher numbers and in teacher quality is exacerbated by a "growing disparity between the proportion of minority students in elementary and high schools and the proportion of minority teachers available to instruct them...[which in turn]...threatens directly the viability of a pluralistic society" (Southern Education Foundation [SEF], 1988, pp. 4-6). Clearly, we need more minority teachers. It is a problem too serious to be ignored and too large to be solved in a simple, linear fashion by one or two isolated agencies. It is a problem that requires the combined energies of many groups and the creativity that can come from a collaborative

endeavor.

This paper describes the work of one collaborative--The Consortium on Teacher Quality and Supply--that combined the energies of several organizations in order to respond to the minority teacher shortage. The paper is organized both chronologically and conceptually. Chronologically, it begins with the establishment of the Consortium in 1987, the introduction of key players and a discussion of aims. It then moves to the collaborative process the consortium underwent, explains the activities designed by the consortium to address the minority teacher shortage, and ends with a progress report on current consortium activities.

Conceptually, the paper examines the collaborative process in relation to what the literature has to say about successful collaborations, and uncovers some new understandings about factors which help support and facilitate collaboration. In essence, it is a paper which attempts to present both the products and the process of a particular collaborative endeavor.

Black teachers: A particular concern

In 1987, the Southern Education Foundation (SEF) secured a planning grant from Bell South to consider ways in which to alleviate the minority teacher shortage. SEF is a public charity whose principal purpose is the promotion of equal and quality education for Blacks and disadvantaged Southerners. No doubt teachers from all minority groups are a scarce commodity.

Nonetheless, SEF was especially interested in addressing the Black teacher shortage given its mission and the particularly acute need for Black educators. This acute need has resulted from several forces working simultaneously:

1) Despite increased high school completion rates among Blacks, college attendance and completion rates of Black students has actually declined (Garibaldi, 1987).

2) Like other college groups, Blacks exhibit a diminishing interest in the teaching profession. The top Black students (according to SAT scores) aspire primarily to careers in engineering, health/medicine, computer science and the social sciences. Fewer than 1% of this group express an interest in education (Baratz, 1986).

3) Reform in teacher education and certification has resulted in more and more states mandating "teaching" tests as a prerequisite for a standard license to teach. These tests have become barriers to certification for minorities, especially Blacks who pass at significantly lower rates than whites (Haney, Madeus, & Kreitzer, 1987).

4) Blacks and other minorities are disproportionately represented in vocational or general education tracks (Goodlad, 1984; Oakes, 1985), which leave them inadequately prepared for college. Consequently, the number of Black students in the pipeline and available to the teaching profession is further jeopardized.

5) The reform movement has led to more stringent high school

graduation requirements that could adversely affect student success and high school completion, particularly that of Black students.

6) Black colleges in the southern states, which provide "more than half of the baccalaureate degrees awarded to Blacks" (Graham, 1987, p. 600), awarded fewer education degrees (74% in 1976; 63% in 1981).

The Consortium on Teacher Quality and Supply

With the support of the planning grant, SEF responded to these serious circumstances by inviting (in 1987) six historically Black colleges and universities in the south (HBCUs) and three graduate institutions of education to collaboratively address this critical need. The six HBCUs--Albany State College, Bethune-Cookman College, Grambling State University, Johnson C. Smith University, Tuskegee University and Xavier University are all located in states which evidence a wide gap between the proportion of minority students and the proportion of available minority educators. The six HBCUs had also had, "a strong presence and long involvement in the field of teacher education [and] each is noted for recent efforts addressing issues which affect the supply and quality of minority teachers" (SEF, 1987, p. 8). The three graduate schools of education--Columbia University, Harvard University and Vanderbilt University--had all demonstrated a commitment to resolving equity and education questions and had in place mechanisms to encourage the preparation of more qualified Black teachers. The nine institutions, with SEF, joined forces to form

a Consortium which committed itself to working together to increase the quality and supply of Black educators.

The Consortium: purpose and process

Obviously, bringing together players is only the first step in creating a working collaborative among very diverse institutions. According to the literature, effective collaborative efforts demand:

1) high level commitment
2) mutual needs and interests
3) clarity about goals, roles and control
4) sufficient time
5) energy
6) effective communication
7) resources
8) leadership
9) ongoing evaluation
10) incentives (Ascher, 1988; De Bevoise, 1986; Hord, 1986; Mickelson, Kritek, Hedlund & Kaufmann, 1988).

A description of the consortium's progress and process as a successful collaborative gives these generalities texture and reveals how they look in practice.

High-level commitment. According to a recent ERIC Clearinghouse Digest (1988, p. 2), "the most effective collaboratives begin with commitments at the highest levels." The work of the consortium began with the commitments of senior officers from each of the nine

institutions--presidents, vice presidents, provosts or deans--who agreed to actively support the work of the consortium. These senior officers each designated two of their faculty to participate in the process. These faculty members were chosen on the basis of previous experience in teacher education and in the administration of teacher education programs, concern for and an understanding of the minority teacher shortage and, a willingness to devote energy to a collaborative effort. In addition, SEF also committed three of its members (including the president) to the collaborative, and invited the participation of three members of its Task Force on Issues in Education and Employment who would help facilitate the work of the consortium. Thus, from the very beginning, the consortium received adequate support on both institutional and individual levels.

Mutual needs and interests. This support or commitment was, in a sense, easily attained because of long-standing relationships that existed between several of the university administrators, supporting the notion that, "long standing ties between partner institutions seems an important contributing factor in encouraging partners to initiate a more formal arrangement." (Mickelson, et al, 1988, p. 26). More importantly, the institutions involved were unified by common needs and interests. They all agreed that there was, first of all, a problem, and that this problem demanded a multifaceted, multi-institutional response. The mission of the consortium also coincided with institutional self-interests so that collaborating would benefit each of the institutions in some way.

Beyond the professional satisfaction of working together to address a mutual concern, the member institutions could look forward to improving the quality of entering college students, increasing enrollments in teacher preparation programs, improving services or facilities, expanding the extent or scope of education projects, acquiring knowledge through increased research opportunities, enriching or diversifying student bodies and faculties, and attracting nation-wide interest. In essence, a "win-win" relationship was established in which all the participants stood to gain, and so all the institutions shared an investment in addressing the problem.

Clarity about goals, roles and control. Bringing together autonomous and very different institutions for the purpose of group work and problem-solving required that goals, roles and questions of control be clarified. Though all the participating institutions acknowledged the problem and were interested in doing something about it, there still existed a great distance between problem identification and problem solution. Bridging the void demanded setting up a logical sequence of goals and objectives designed to drive the work of the consortium towards a given end. A plan for collaboration was articulated--the development of a collaborative proposal that would recommend activities and programs which could help alleviate the minority teacher shortage.

Enabling a group of twenty-seven academics to write a joint proposal was no mean feat and called for an equitable division of labor, role clarification, and a framework which would help the

group conceptualize the problem and focus their energies. To render the task more manageable, the group was divided into three sub-committees, each of which was charged with examining the shortage of Black teachers from a particular angle. In keeping with the desire to address the problem in a broad and comprehensive manner, the issues surrounding the shortage of Black teachers were conceptualized as a continuum along which three categories of concern could be identified--1) pipeline and recruitment concerns; 2) academic preparation of Black teachers; 3) concerns with post-graduate and certification experiences. Each sub-committee was given the task of developing a mini-proposal designed to address the issues surrounding each category of concern. Sub-committees consisted of ten members, each one from the nine participating institutions and a member of the SEF task force on education and employment. Consortium members elected sub-committee membership based on personal interests and expertise. In this way, an unwieldy task became less daunting and enabled the consortium to match talents to specific needs.

Sub-dividing a large group and providing a focus, while helpful, was still not enough to facilitate the work ahead. Nine articulate and experienced people thrown together do not necessarily become a cohesive group unless mechanisms are deliberately included that will help orchestrate the work of the group and enable it to maintain the commitment and energy required to accomplish a community purpose. This role fell to each of the members of the SEF task force on education and employment. These

three individuals came to the consortium with a great deal of experience that included an understanding of institutions (and members) of higher education, a long-term affiliation with the work and mission of SEF, and a substantive involvement in efforts to increase the educational attainment of Blacks. As outsiders without any connections to the nine participating institutions, they were unfettered by institutional agendas or constraints which enabled them to objectively forward the collective goals of the effort. These three individuals took on leadership roles in the sub-committees which included keeping the sub-committees on-task, equitably distributing "air time" and work, assigning tasks and developing agendas, providing a direction to discussions, and acting as liaisons between the sub-committees, the full consortium and SEF. It was clear from the start that each group leader was skilled in group process as they expertly guided the work and thinking of cub-committee members by summarizing or clarifying ideas, pulling discussions back from unrelated digressions, setting up a series of intermediate goals (which translated into a series of small successes), and coaxing the group towards consensus. The work of the group leaders was, undoubtedly, instrumental in sustaining the collaborative once the novelty of an exciting endeavor naturally waned. Upon further reflection , what also becomes more apparent is that collaboration requires moving beyond merely clarifying goals, roles and questions of control initially; successful collaboration demands that role clarification and goal-setting occur in continuous cycles, so that responsibilities and

aims are constantly restated, refined, and evaluated. This ensures that the collaborative process stays goal-focused, but not so focused that it becomes myopic, that the players are constantly reminded of their roles, yet encouraged to take on new responsibilities as progress is made, and that expectations and understandings held by individual members remain integrally tied to common aims.

Sufficient time. Between September 1987 and January 1988, the full consortium met twice (over two days) while the three sub-committees on recruitment, academic preparation and post-certification met for two or three days each. Meetings were deliberately lengthy to give the collaborative enough time to accomplish stated goals. In many ways, any amount of time given to a collective effort is both sufficient and inadequate since collaborations sometimes take on lives of their own and grow to fill whatever spaces they are afforded. Thus, setting January 1988 as the deadline for sub-committee work on particular sections of the proposal helped to contain the collaborative by imposing an urgent need to meet the target date. This time limit was not established capriciously; rather, it responded to the proposal submission deadlines of funding agencies. The incentive for making the deadline was additional funding so that the consortium would be able to go beyond idea generation to implementation, from possibility to actuality. Meetings, as a result, were always intensive and task-oriented because each institution had a stake in attracting the interest of funding sources. The work of this

collaborative then, modifies the notion of sufficient time for collaboration to sufficient time within reasonable limits to provoke the timely completion of work.

Energy. The rewards of collaborative work are often most apparent before the collaboration has begun or after it has ended. Sustaining energy during the process is most problematic as collaborators become impatient with the extended time simple tasks sometimes take and thoughts turn to how much less complex working independently can be. Though energy levels amongst consortium members remained fairly high, the collaborative still needed "reaching-out, action-taking individuals...to...sustain the collaborative spirit" (Hord, 1986, p. 26). This spirit was consistently nurtured by the sub-committee group leaders and by SEF members, all of whom were unflaggingly optimistic and enthusiastic. Their enthusiasm, coupled with their sage use of praise, positive reinforcement and acknowledgements of even small accomplishments kept the collaborative process moving at an energetic pace. Their use of these very basic strategies helped consortium members remember the soundness and worth of the collaborative's purposes. Consortium members themselves also encouraged each other through the constant generation of new ideas and the creation of informal personal ties. In this way, the role of "cheerleader" changed hands from one consortium member to another, so that each individual had a part in maintaining the drive needed to continue.

Effective communication. One factor which also helped to sustain energy was the development of a communication system that

operated both formally and informally. "Large- and small-group meetings are a continuing requirement." Frequent interactions at all levels across...organizations are a necessity (Hord, 1986, p. 26). As discussed previously, the consortium met as a whole group as well as in smaller committees. Within committees, smaller temporary work groups consisting of two or three people developed for problem-solving or brain-storming purposes. Working within a deadline necessitated that consortium members work together beyond the confines of the organized meetings. Often meetings would end with tasks assigned jointly to individuals at different institutions. This tactic not only underscored the collaborative nature of the endeavor, but ensured that communication between institutions was ongoing as consortium members had to connect with each other via mail and phone in order to complete assigned tasks before the next meeting.

To further facilitate communication, a consortium "yellow pages" was developed with the names, addresses and phone numbers of all members, a tool that was heavily used. Administratively, SEF acted as an information clearinghouse so that all correspondence--drafts, brochures, course syllabi, program descriptions, letters, etc.--were duplicated and distributed to the entire consortium. SEF also provided secretarial support which meant that the proceedings of each meeting could be encapsulated and shared.

Informally, communication was encouraged by the inclusion of, what could be called "group down-time." Gatherings always included the opportunity for consortium members to come to know each other

more intimately. Group luncheons, cocktails hours or socials enabled consortium members to become more familiar with one another, to interact as friends. The inclusion of socializing time is neither novel nor terribly creative, yet it allowed relationships to develop, which, in a sense, obligated consortium members to further the collaborative. One is less likely to let friends down than strangers.

Resources. The work of the collaborative was immeasurably aided by the presence of adequate resources. The planning grant provided by Bell South financed travel, meeting space, hotel accommodations when required and helped defray administrative costs. In essence, the basic needs of the collaborative were assured. However, resources defined broadly include human resources and it is in this area that the consortium contributed handsomely. As stated earlier, institutions committed the services of the three individuals to the collaboration who in turn gave a great deal of personal and professional time to the consortium. Often weekends were the only convenient times for meetings; often drafts or work needed to be completed when there was little time to spare. Consortium members made time available for the common good. This translated into well-attended meetings and progress.

Leadership of the collaborative came from several sources. As previously described, leadership came from SEF members and from the three individuals associated with the SEF task force on education and employment. Additionally, to oversee the work of the collaborative, a steering committee was created with

representatives from each of the participating universities, SEF task force members, and the SEF representatives themselves. This advisory board served as a sounding board for ideas, monitored overall progress and evaluated all proposals generated by the collaborative. In this way, every institution had a say in all consortium activities and had the opportunity to offer feedback and suggestions. Steering committee members also served as links between the collaborative and the individual institutions. They were another component in a complex communication network.

Ongoing evaluation. The steering committee became a mechanism as well as communication and leadership. This evaluative role deepened after the initial proposal was funded and the collaborative moved beyond planning to implementation. What ongoing evaluation, as well as the incentives for collaborating, meant in this effort becomes more explicit when current activities of the consortium are discussed.

Increasing the quality and supply of Black teachers: A plan for action

In January 1988, the Consortium had accomplished its first major goal--the completion of a collaboratively created proposal to increase the number and quality of BLack teachers. This proposal had gone through several revisions and had evolved from a large collection of creative "ideals" (what we could do if we could do everything and had unlimited resources) to a refined, realistically-grounded set of activities which had successfully

passed an evaluation conducted by the steering committee. In deciding which activities or programs to emphasize in the proposal, the steering committee was guided by a series of important questions. Do the programs--

1) address the issue from a variety of perspectives (recruitment, academic preparation and post-certification)?

2) lend themselves to immediate and effective implementation?

3) continue to support collaboration amongst the nine institutions?

4) lend themselves to growth and improvement over time?

5) allow for implementation at reduced costs should initial funding be less than anticipated?

(SEF, 1998)

This "paring-down," resulted in a proposal which consisted of seven elements--

The Teacher Cadet Program. Geared to pipeline issues, the program is aimed at middle school students and seeks to "enhance the confidence of Black youngsters, strengthen their academic development and achievement, increase their interest in and exposure to higher education, and raise interest among Black students, particularly males, in teaching" (SEF, 1988, p. 20). Through this program, 20-25 students, over a 26-week period, participate in activities designed to help them hone their academic skills, explore the possibilities of teaching as a career, enhance self-esteem and responsible, goal-oriented behavior, and interact with mentors (college education majors and faculty). A major

component of this program is incentive awards that recognize academic achievement and self-development, and wide-spread dissemination of "success" stories to the community and to businesses. This should encourage more Black youngsters to consider teaching as a career, and could enlist corporate support in the development of future job or scholarship opportunities. Most importantly, the program creates linkages between public schools, communities, Black colleges, business interest and college students currently working towards teacher certification. These linkages serve to combine the energies of separate constituents in addressing a problem that concerns all.

The Summer Enrichment Program for Future Teachers. Like the Teacher Cadet Program, this program addresses pipeline issues as well as leadership development and the enhancement of HBCU teacher education programs. The program serves middle and high school students who have completed sixth and eleventh grades respectively, and provides activities and support services to Black youth similar to those offered by the Teacher Cater Program. The major difference is that these students experience a more comprehensive, residential, six-week program on the campus of a HBCU. Though the two age-groups experience separate programs, opportunities for inter-age interactions promote cooperation and the building of student-to-student support systems. Unlike the Teacher Cadet Program, the Summer Enrichment Program could have an immediate impact on enrollment in teacher education programs at HBCU campuses.

Summer Scholars Program. This program responds to academic preparation concerns by providing educational enrichment to twenty-four HBCU undergraduates through a summer residential program on the campus of a graduate institution. Nominated by their institutions, participants spend 7-8 weeks taking courses to deepen their understanding of subject matter, visiting schools, interacting with teachers and educational leaders, and exploring careers and issues in education. The program is open to both education and non-education majors and so serves to attract liberal arts majors to the teaching profession. For students who have already declared an interest in teaching, the program enhances their status as education majors and helps strengthen their commitment to the profession by celebrating their choice and exposing them to the role models and possible mentors in the field.

Faculty Exchange and Enrichment. This effort further underscores the collaborative nature of the consortium. Participating institutions are afforded additional opportunities for idea exchange, program or materials development and professional renewal. Institutions will be both hosts and visitors in exchanges that could include the chance to co-teach, interact with other faculty, explore mutual research interests or acquire new knowledge. This program helps, "maintain the ongoing dialogue necessary to develop and refine programs to alleviate the shortage of Black teachers...[and serves as]...an important crucible for ideas" (SEF, 1988, p. 31).

The Minority Leadership Center. Beyond a critical shortage in

the number of Black teachers, there exists a dearth of Black principals and educational leaders. The consortium's definition of "Black educator" broadly encompasses individuals who need not necessarily be in the classroom but provide direction to the field of education. This program provides for the development of minority leadership centers for the preparation of Black principals, superintendents and policy makers. Leadership Center participants will engage in activities designed to give them the knowledge and experiences they need to take on leadership roles in the schools--seminars, workshops, visits of a variety of school districts, certification programs and internships.

Collaborative Research and Evaluation. To ensure self-study and the further generation of new understandings and ideas, the proposal provides for a fund to support collaborative research and evaluation efforts amongst the nine participating institutions. This fund specifically supports the, "need for an ongoing analysis of continuing causes of the shortfall along with evaluations of programs which work; analysis of what doesn't work; and ideas for new programs" (SEF, 1988, p. 35). Thus, evaluation becomes an integral part of all activities and allows the consortium to examine critically all that it does with an eye towards improvement, dissemination and creative problem-solving. As a result, implementation, documentation, modification and expansion all occur concurrently.

Continuation of Consortium Activities. This is not a "program" obviously, but the bedrock of the collaborative. Because the

implementation of all the activities discussed by the proposal are dependent upon a viable consortium be maintained as a fully functioning entity. Without the consortium, the effort would degenerate into a fragmented series of isolated activities. This component of the proposal provides the "glue" needed to keep the consortium working collaboratively by sustaining the work of SEF. SEF continues to serve in an advisory and administrative capacity by convening meetings, linking institutions, marketing consortium activities, and, with the steering committee, overseeing progress. This final component underscores the need collaboratives have for a body that functions as a catalyst for continued collaboration.

The proposal complete, the senior officers of the nine participating institutions met to reconfirm their commitment to the collaborative by endorsing the plan. Though it was a celebratory moment, the completion of the proposal also signaled a wait for funding so that the collaborative could continue its work. SEF undertook the task of soliciting the support and financial backing needed. In April 1988, the consortium received a $1.75 million in funding from Bell South and Pew Charitable Trust to support activities proposed over a three-year period. The second phase of the collaborative work of the consortium had begun.

Current activities of the consortium:
or what collaboration now means

Currently, the consortium is deeply engaged in implementation and all the activities discussed in the proposal are in process.

One round of the Summer Scholars Program has already been completed and a second round is being planned. The Teacher Cadet Program is underway while the Summer Enrichment Program, faculty exchanges and the leadership center are gearing up to begin. However, what seems more important to discuss at this juncture is not what the programs offer since the proposal explains this, but the ongoing collaborative process. The question that begs asking is, "How do nine institutions implement separate activities collaboratively?"

When the proposal was completed, institutions expressed interest in particular activities outlined in the plan. As a result, specific institutions were designated as "lead" institutions and charged with piloting selected programs when funding became available. It was clearly established that no one institution "owned" any particular activity, so "lead" institutions were also made responsible for bringing a second institution on board. This meant including the follow-up institution in program planning, information exchange and evaluation. In this way, institutions would become learners and teachers as they worked together to ensure effective implementation. Program ownership would remain collective which would continue to foster the collaborative work of the consortium while encouraging collaboration amongst institutions interested in implementing common programs.

At present, each of the nine institutions has assumed leadership with at least one program and is working in cooperation with at least one other "follow-up" institution. All implementation plans are discussed and reviewed by the steering

committee which makes suggestions, offers feedback and assistance and makes sure each program remains tightly connected to the overall purpose of the consortium. Collaboration helps keep all the institutions focused and ensures that no institution struggles alone. It continues to work and also to demand work; it works because leadership is shared and the effort required to nurture the collaborative is willingly given because the rewards available are a direct result of the collaboration--funding, ideas, new programs, opportunities for research and professional dialogue and association.

Reflections on collaboration

The portrayal of this collaborative may appear to be blemish-free in that it seems all went smoothly all the time. Naturally, this is not entirely true. The consortium had to overcome obstacles that presented themselves in the form of disagreements, problems, time constraints, incorrectly held assumptions and individual or institutional self-interests. Many obstacles were avoided because of the presence of good communication, adequate resources, commitment, time, role clarification, leadership, etc. However, upon reflection, it is clear that this collaborative's success resulted from other factors not mentioned explicitly in the literature on collaboration.

First of all, successful collaboratives require <u>levels of collaboration</u>. In this effort, collaboration occurred amongst nine institutions, but it also happened on a smaller scale when groups

of two or three institutions would join forces to deal with micro-concerns or work on particular programs. Membership in these mini collaborative groups overlapped, like a huge venn diagram, so each institution connected with several others which undoubtedly strengthened the collaborative as a whole.

Second, successful collaboratives need to continually redefine themselves and their work. Collaboratives usually begin with the same understandings; that is why individual organizations decide to collaborate in the first place. But these mutually held understandings can become blurred over time and so require constant reaffirmation and rearticulation. Also, as the work of the collaborative progresses, initial roles, communication mechanisms and objectives laid down may become inappropriate. Again, roles, leadership functions, aims, resource distributions, etc. need to be adapted and redefined to keep pace with new ground covered by the collaborative. This consortium works because its members keep shifting as the collaborative moves forward and meetings often include discussions which help realign thinking, redefine goals or roles, and restructure practice.

Third, this collaborative has been successful because "turf" issues were minimized. Linking small liberal arts institutions with large research universities can lead to what could be termed "the big brother" syndrome with the larger institutions patronizing the smaller ones, or the smaller institutions fighting for equal recognition and say. This may seem to be a petty problem and yet pettiness between partners can never result in the development of

trust or equal working relationships. One way to avoid this was to ensure that all institutions took the lead for at least one program. Another strategy was to highlight the fact that each institution had something to offer the others. Thus, deliberately included in initial group discussions was the chance for each institution to showcase some of its own unique programs. These individual programs became the foundation for the collective ideas expressed in the proposal and ensured that all consortium members contributed equally to the effort. Obviously these are not only ways "turf" issues can be overcome; the more important factor to remember is that unless they are addressed, individual self-interest can sabotage any attempts at collaboration.

The consortium is now in its second year of operation and will continue for at least another year and a half. Given the way the nine institutions have worked together, it seems likely that the professional relationships forged by this collaborative effort will continue long after funds have been depleted. Clearly, such an ambitious set of activities could not have been accomplished on so large a scale in such a short time by a single institution. Despite the talents of the individual institutions, joining forces undoubtedly resulted in a collective response to the minority teacher shortage that goes beyond quick band-aid fixes and addresses the problem in a deep, substantive and comprehensive manner.

REFERENCES

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (1988). Urban school/community collaborations: Making them work well. Digest, (ISSN 08898049).

Darling-Hammond, L. & Pittman, K. J. (1987). Career choices for minorities: Who will teach? Washington, DC: National Education Association.

De Bevoise, W. (1986). Collaboration: Some principles of bridgework. Educational Leadership, 43(5),9-12.

Galambos, E. C. (1985). Teacher preparation: The Anatomy of a college degree. Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board.

Garibaldi, A. M. (1987). Quality and diversity in schools: The case for an expanded pool of minority teachers. Racine, WI: American Association of Colleges.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Graham, P. A. (April, 1987). Black teachers: A drastically scarce resource. Phi Beta Kappan, 598-605.

Haney, W., Madaus, G., & Kreitzer, A. (1987). Charms talismanic: Testing teachers for the improvement of American education. Review of Research in Education, 14, 169-238.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hords, S. M. (1986). A synthesis of research on organizational collaboration. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 22-26.

Mickelson, D. J., Kritek, W. J., Hedluns, R. D., & Kaufman, A. (1988). Urban school-university collaboration. New York: The Ford Foundation.

The National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track. New Haven: Yale University Press.

The Southern Education Foundation. (1988). Enhancing the production of minority teachers: Implementing a consortium approach. Atlanta: Author.

The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.